

## **REMARKS**

This submission is in response to the Office Action dated April 24, 2008 (the “Office Action”). Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 18, 19, 21-27, 34-39, 42-46, 53-60, 62-68 and 70-73 are pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 27 and 37. Support for the amendments herein may be found in the specification in at least paragraphs [1005], [1006], [1019], [1024], [1025], [1026].

**Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 18-19, 21-23, 25-27, 34-35, 37-39, 42-45, 53-60, 62-68 and 70-73 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 18-19, 21-23, 25-27, 34-35, 37-39, 42-45, 53-60, 62-68 and 70-73 on page 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,766,175 B2 (Uchiyama) in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0072544 A1 (Alexis) and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0119800 A1 (Jaggers). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis and Jaggers, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising a digital interface module configured to receive data from a USB interface and determine when the data is to be provided to one of the wireless wide area network interface, the display control module, and a call control module, where the digital interface module is further configured to monitor information received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface to determine when received data is to be provided to one of the universal serial bus (USB) or a standardized input/output media interface, as in claim 1. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least paragraphs [1024], [1025], [1026] and FIG. 2 of Applicants’ application.

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Jaggers merely describe an I/O interface controller 182 (analogous to the digital interface module of the invention) that sends video signals to the display 192 and is also coupled to USB Hub 193, which in turn is coupled to

external I/O devices. *See* Jagers at par. 28 and Fig. 1B. There is no teaching or disclosure in Jagers of a digital interface module configured to receive the data from the USB interface and to determine when the data is to be provided to one of the wireless wide area network interface, the display control module and a call control module, where the digital interface module is further configured to monitor the information received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface to determine when received data is to be provided to one of the universal serial bus (USB) interface and a standardized input/output media interface, as in claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the I/O interface controller 182, as disclosed in Jagers, is different from the digital interface module recited in claim 1. Therefore, the cited portions of Jagers fail to disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising a digital interface module configured to receive the data from the USB interface and to determine when the data is to be provided to one of the wireless wide area network interface, the display control module and a call control module, where the digital interface module is further configured to monitor the information received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface to determine when received data is to be provided to one of the universal serial bus (USB) interface and a standardized input/output media interface. The Office does not cite portions of Uchiyama or Alexis for disclosing this element of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness does not exist based on the combination of the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jagers et al. since all of the elements of claim 1 are not found in the combination of references. Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn, and Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Also, claim 1 is allowable for the additional reason that the combination of the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jagers et al. does not disclose a display control module configured to monitor information received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface, at an alphanumeric keypad and at a digital interface module.

The cited portions of Alexis merely disclose a display control module configured to receive the outgoing text messages and to determine whether the outgoing text messages should be visually displayed at the display. Claim 1 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 3, 4, 9-12, 18, 19, and 53-60 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 9-12, 18, 19, and 53-60 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed by the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jagers et al. For example, the cited portions of Alexis do not disclose an apparatus wherein the display control module receives input from the alphanumeric keypad, as recited in claim 12. Instead, the cited portions of Alexis disclose a keypad on the base unit that can be used to place and receive calls. *Alexis*, paragraph [0046]. However, the display on the base unit does not receive input from the keypad on the base unit. *Alexis*, paragraph [0079]. Instead, the display on the base unit displays call type data, call status data, user instructions, phone book numbers from a memory, and data received from the landline or the wireless communication network. *Alexis*, paragraph [0079]. The combination of the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jagers et al. does not disclose an apparatus wherein the display control module receives input from the alphanumeric keypad. For this additional reason, claim 12 is allowable.

The Office has rejected claim 27 on page 14 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Uchiyama in view of Alexis and further in view of Jagers. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis and Jagers et al. does not disclose a method for relaying wireless local area telephone calls from a wireless local area telephone to a wireless wide area network telephone comprising a display control module coupled to a first interface of the base station to determine when monitored information should be displayed on a visual display and further comprising a digital interface module coupled to the first interface of the base station to

determine when monitored information should be provided to a universal serial bus (USB) or a standardized input/output media interface, as in claim 27.

In contrast to claim 27, Uchiyama describes a method for making an outgoing call. The method is described in Uchiyama in view of the software flow diagram of FIG. 10. The method describes the steps of a user entering a telephone number into a cordless telephone and pressing the TALK key on the cordless telephone; the cordless telephone responsively sending the entered telephone number to the docking station via a radio link; if the wireless telephone is not in the cradle of the docking station, the docking station notifying the cordless telephone of this unavailability; the process returning to the standby mode. On the other hand, if the wireless telephone is in the cradle, the docking station controller coupling the dialed telephone number to the wireless telephone via the data bus, and also coupling 'send' command, which causes the wireless telephone to originate the call to the dialed number; connecting the call; and proceeding until one of the parties terminates the call. The above method of Uchiyama does not describe at least one element of claim 27. Therefore, Uchiyama fails to disclose or suggest a display control module a display control module coupled to a first interface of the base station to determine when monitored information should be displayed on a visual display and further comprising a digital interface module coupled to the first interface of the base station to determine when monitored information should be provided to a universal serial bus (USB) or a standardized input/output media interface, as in claim 27.

Alexis describes a communication system 100 including features of text communication. In particular, Alexis describes communication devices 102, 110 connected via interface circuitry 106 to a ring-tip line pair 104 for landline calls over the PSTN 105. Interface circuitry 106 permits both landline calls via PSTN 105 and wireless calls via wireless communication network 107 to be placed and received using communication device 102. Alexis further discloses a base unit 204 including a speaker 211, a microphone 212, a keypad 213, and in one embodiment a display. *See* Alexis at par [0079]. The display may be used to provide the call type data, call status data and/or user instructions discussed above (in textual, graphic, image, and/or video form, for example). These displays may be based on data stored in memory 42. In addition, the display may be used to display any other data (including video, images, and graphics) stored in

memory 42 or obtained from the landline or the wireless communication network. Audio corresponding to the video may be output via the base unit's speaker. Applicants respectfully submit that the display taught in Alexis does not include a display control module coupled to an interface of a base station to determine when the monitored information should be displayed on a visual display. Therefore, Alexis fails to disclose or suggest a display control module coupled to an interface of the base station to determine when the monitored information should be displayed on a visual display, as in claim 27.

Further, Alexis describes a USB connection to allow interface circuitry 1100 to have the capability to make/receive landline, cellular, and VOIP telephone calls. *See* Alexis at par [0146]. Applicants respectfully submit that the USB connection taught in Alexis is different than a digital interface module coupled to an interface of the base station to determine when the monitored information should be provided to one of a universal serial bus (USB) interface or a standardized input/output media interface. Therefore, Alexis fails to disclose or suggest a digital interface module coupled to the first interface of the base station to determine when monitored information should be provided to a universal serial bus (USB) or a standardized input/output media interface, as in claim 27.

Claims 34-36 and 62-68 depend from claim 27, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 34-36 and 62-68 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 27.

The Office has rejected claim 37 on page 20 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Uchiyama in view of Alexis and further in view of Jaggers. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 37.

The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis and Jaggers at al. does not disclose a method for communicating with an external device from a base station, communicating with the external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface of the base station, the external device having an interface to send data for visual display on a display of the base station; transferring the data communicated from the external device through the USB interface to one of a display

control module or a call control module; displaying the data communicated from the external device on the display of the base station in the case where the data is transferred to the display control module; and communicating the data communicated from the external device to the wireless local area telephone in the case where the data is transferred to the call control module.

The Final Office Action acknowledges that the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the Final Office Action maintains these features were well known in the art, as taught by Jaggars. *See* Final Office Action, p. 22.

Applicants disagree. Applicants submit that the cited portions of Jaggars fail to disclose the specific combination of claim 37. For example, the cited portions of Jaggars do not disclose or suggest transferring the data communicated from the external device through the USB interface to one of an interface module, a display control module or a call control module; communicating the data communicated from the external device to the wireless local area telephone in the case where the data is transferred to the call control module; communicating the data communicated from the external device to the wireless wide area network telephone in the case where the data is transferred to the call control module, as in claim 37. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least paragraph [1024].

In contrast to claim 37, the cited portions of Jaggars discloses a Dock I/O interface controller coupled to USB Hub and associated I/O interface controller logic. *See* Fig. 2 of Jaggars. The I/O interface controller logic operates as follows. If a dock-detect signal is received, then event 215 in I/O interface logic determines if an I/O interface device is connected to the dock (base station). If it is determined that an I/O interface device is connected to the dock at event 215, then data is transferred from dock I/O interface controller 182 in event 225. *See* Par. 30 of Jaggars. Next, at event 230, I/O interface controller 120 logic determines if the dock display capabilities are greater than or equal to the wireless communication device (WCD) display capabilities. If the dock display capabilities are less than WCD display capabilities, then it is determined at event 250 whether the dock is connected to an external data connection. If event 250 determines the dock is not connected to an external data connection, then event 255

directs WAP data from RF transceiver 150 to WCD display 140. If event 250 determines the dock is connected to an external data connection then event 260 directs WAP data from dock I/O interface controller 182 to WCD display 140. Then, if at event 230 the logic determines the dock display capabilities are greater than or equal to the wireless communication device display capabilities, then event 240 determines if the dock is connected to external data connection 196. If event 240 determines the dock is not connected to external data 196 connection then HTTP data is sent from RF transceiver 150 to dock display 192. If event 240 determines the dock is connected to an external data connection 196 then, HTTP data is sent from I/O interface controller 182 to dock display 192.

Therefore, the cited portions of Jagers fail to disclose or suggest transferring the data communicated from the external device through the USB interface to one of an interface module, a display control module or a call control module; communicating the data communicated from the external device to the wireless local area telephone in the case where the data is transferred to the call control module; communicating the data communicated from the external device to the wireless wide area network telephone in the case where the data is transferred to the interface control module, as in claim 37. Instead, Jagers merely discloses that in the case where an I/O device is connected to a dock (base station), data is transferred from the I/O device, via an I/O interface controller, to one of a WCD display or dock display. Claim 37 is thus allowable.

#### **Claims 24, 36 and 46 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 24, 36 and 46 on page 29 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Uchiyama in view of Alexis and further in view of Jagers et al. and United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0111190 (Harrison et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 24, 36 and 46 depend from claims 1, 27 and 37 respectively. As such, the combination of the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis and Jagers et al. fail to disclose at least one element of claims 1, 27 and 37 as set forth above. The cited portions of Harrison et al. merely disclose a base station to which a personal digital assistant (PDA) can be attached for charging. *See* Harrison et al., paragraph [0011]. Data from the PDA can also be downloaded

onto the base station for back up storage in case the PDA becomes subsequently damaged. *See* Harrison et al., paragraph [0002]. Therefore, the cited portions of Harrison, in combination with the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis, Jaggers, and Harrison fail to disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising a digital interface module configured to receive data from a USB interface and determine when the data is to be provided to one of the wireless wide area network interface, the display control module, and a call control module (as in claim 1); or monitoring the information included in the outgoing text communication signal at a digital interface module coupled to the first interface of the base station to determine when the monitored information should be provided to one of a universal serial bus (USB) interface or a standardized input/output media interface (as in claim 27); or transferring the data communicated from the external device through the USB interface to at least one of an interface module, a display control module or a call control module (as in claim 37). As such, incorporation of the cited portions of Harrison et al. into the combination of the cited portions of Uchiyama, Alexis and Jaggers et al. fail to disclose at least one element of claims 1, 27 and 37 as set forth above and Applicants submit that these claims are thus allowable.

Claims 24, 36 and 46 depend from claims 1, 27 and 37 respectively, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 24, 36 and 46 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 1, 27 and 37 respectively.



### Conclusion

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

7-23-2008

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER LAW GROUP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES  
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5575 (fax)